REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, further examination and reconsideration of the objections and rejections in the Office Action of August 19, 2008 are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to make grammatical and idiomatic improvements in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. The amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification and abstract. No new matter has been added. Also attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and abstract by the current amendment. The attachment is captioned "**Version with Markings to Show Changes Made**."

Replacement drawing sheets have been submitted for Figures 1-4, amending the figures to contain legends designating them as prior art. No new matter has been added to the application. Entry of these replacement drawings is respectfully requested, and it is requested that the Examiner indicate approval and entry of these drawings in the next Office Action.

On page 2 of the Office Action, drawing Figures 1-4 are objected to because only that which is old is illustrated, but the drawings are not labeled as prior art. These figures have been amended to incorporate legends designating the figures as prior art. Thus, this drawing objection is now inapplicable, and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-22 are objected to because of informalities. The claims have been amended to address the concerns indicated by the Examiner in the Action. This objection is believed no longer applicable to claims 1-22, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-15 have been amended to recite a structural and functional relationship to the medium of the data structure holding unit, characterized in the specification, for example, at page 12 lines 27-31 as DRAM or SDRAM. Claims 19-21 have been amended to recite programs *executed in a computer*. Thus, it is

14

submitted that this rejection is inapplicable to the amended claims, and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

On pages 5-9 of the Office Action, claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia (US 7,380,120). This rejection is traversed and believed inapplicable to the amended claims for the reasons below, and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16-21 recite encrypting, decrypting, and data reproducing apparatuses, methods, and programs executed in a computer, each having a header analyzing unit (or step) able to analyze the header section of the file and to obtain a first value *stored in a field included in the header section*, and a header converting unit (or step) able to convert the first value into *a second value* according to a predetermined conversion rule, the second value having a size such that *the second value is storable within the field included in the header section*, and in which the header converting unit replaces the first value with the second value in the field included in the header section. This is not disclosed in the prior art of record.

Garcia discloses encrypting a file, including encrypting the header. However, Garcia does *not* disclose encrypting a first value stored in a field in the header to produce an encrypted (i.e., second) value such that the second value is storable in the same field from which the second value was read.

The result of this deficiency is that Garcia discloses a system in which the encrypted header is *larger* than the original header, as in shown in Figure 4 of the present application, illustrating a result of a conventional encryption system. This results in the access information for the digital data in the file having to be updated (see the discussion of the prior art in the specification at page 4, lines 25-28). Thus, Garcia does not disclose the present invention as recited in the independent claims.

Since Garcia does not address the problem of a change in header size resulting from encryption at all, and the deficiencies of Garcia are not obviated by any of the other prior art of record, no obvious interpretation of Garcia would have resulted in the present invention as recited in claims 1, 6, 11, and 16-21. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6, 11, and

16-21 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record, as are claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 22 depending therefrom.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels that there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshinori MATSUI

/Aldo A. D'Ottavio/
By: 2008.11.18 09:14:09 -05'00'
_____
Aldo A. D'Ottavio
Registration No. 59,559
Agent for Applicant

AAD/JRF/kh
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 19, 2008